

SECRET

LIMITED DISTRIBUTION

NASA review completed.

PMSC 256/64

19 NOV 1964

MEMORANDUM FOR: Deputy Director for Science and Technology
SUBJECT: Thoughts on NASA

25X1A

1. With such items as [redacted] Hyland Panel activity, I must admit I have not had a chance to give careful thought to the question of NASA participation in GMAIC or other intelligence activity, but this note will summarize what I consider to be some of the key points.

2. As I mentioned to General McKee during our lunch with General Carter, I feel that the only way NASA can really help the Intelligence Community is by actually assuming responsibility in this field. Not much will ever come out of an arrangement where we essentially approach NASA "hat-in-hand" and ask them to please help on a specific problem. I feel that continuity is an absolute must and that you achieve this only by taking on the problem on a full-time basis. I do not mean to infer that I think NASA has to put a large number of people to work on intelligence, but I do believe a small nucleus with full-time intelligence responsibility is required. It could be argued that the NASA guys in DMSD represent such a nucleus but it has been my observation that they are too far removed from the NASA main stream to serve that purpose well. I am afraid they are almost like members of our staff and have very little more contact with the real brains in NASA than some of our regular staff employees.

3. As to GMAIC membership, I still believe that a NASA member would be highly desirable provided we had the right individual and that he had appropriate backup and contact within the NASA organization. Whereas Bill Taylor was quite useful, I have my doubts that Tom Hagler (one of the guys working in DMSD) is of any real value to the Committee. His thoughts on intelligence subjects seem to be essentially DMSD thoughts and thus not unique. I see

SECRET

Simon
NASA

SECRET
LIMITED DISTRIBUTION

SUBJECT: Thoughts on NASA

little evidence that he has any real insight into the policy or technical problems of NASA. I would therefore recommend that if we are going to push for NASA membership, it must be made clear that an effective guy with the right contacts and support is required. Additionally, I think the member should have some authority to commit NASA just as all other members find it necessary to speak for and make commitments in behalf of their organizations. I stress this because of Seearns' remarks to me some months ago that he and only he was authorized to tap NASA laboratories for any intelligence activity or support. I understand informally that Dr. Von Braun at Huntsville has tried to get headquarters approval to assign a few people full-time on intelligence analysis projects and has been turned down.

4. As to NASA membership on USIB, I am a little reluctant to argue either way. It is the sure way to tag them with a real responsibility in intelligence, but I am also fully aware that we don't want to open Pandora's box and invite in a half dozen other Government agencies or departments. I just don't have the background knowledge needed to predict with confidence that this problem would in fact develop. It would seem more logical to me that NASA be given some form of limited membership wherein their participation was restricted to matters which were related to their space mission. I would think, however, that if such ground rules were established for a NASA member, it would be necessary to look at other memberships; such as, AEC and FBI, and possibly establish similar ground rules for them.

5. Independent of USIB or CIAIC membership, I am convinced that we need more help from NASA than we are currently receiving. No small part of the problem is the general reluctance to have people cleared for sensitive intelligence data. Of course, here I am referring specifically to clearing some truly competent scientists and engineers who have their fingers directly in the technical programs and are not spending their time shuffling papers. If you could get to the bottom of the NASA attitude on this point, it might be the easiest way to predict the likelihood that there is a serious intent on their part to really do an intelligence job. A number of people have told me that Bob Seearns is the individual who argues against NASA having any more people cleared.

SECRET
UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE

SUBJECT: Thoughts on NASA

6. I hope the above thoughts will be of some value in preparing for your discussions.

(dictated by but not seen by)

CARL E. DUCKETT
Director

Foreign Missile and Space Analysis Center

Distribution:

- Orig & 1 - addressee
- 2 - Director, FMSAC

FMSAC/CEDDockett (19 Nov 64)